R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 579 EA 001 423

PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.

BY- MARQUIT, LAWRENCE J.

PUB DATE 7 FEB 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60 38P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SUPERVISION, *SECONDARY SCHOOLS, *PRINCIPALS, *TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, HYPOTHESIS TESTING, QUESTIONNAIRES, *SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT, PERCEPTION, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, STAFF ORIENTATION, INSERVICE EDUCATION, SPECIAL SERVICES, SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, EVALUATION, PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION,

TO DETERMINE HOW SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY STIMULI, A 36-ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE WAS ADMINISTERED IN 15 THREE- AND FOUR-YEAR SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK STATE, REPRESENTING A STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLE ACCORDING TO STUDENT POPULATION, GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION, AND STATUS AS A CITY OR VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT. RESPONDENTS INCLUDED FIVE PRINCIPALS AND 165 TEACHERS OF VILLAGE SCHOOLS AND 10 PRINCIPALS AND 531 TEACHERS OF CITY SCHOOLS. THE SUPERVISORY PROGRAM WAS DEFINED AS THE COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR WHICH THE PRINCIPAL EXHIBITS TO ACHIEVE INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT. PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS WERE MEASURED ON AN ASCENDING FIVE-POINT SCALE FOR NINE CATEGORIES OF SUPERVISORY TASKS--CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATION, STAFFING, PROVISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, ORIENTATION OF NEW INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF, INSERVICE EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, COORDINATION OF SPECIAL SERVICES, DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, AND EVALUATION. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA SHOWED THAT PRINCIPALS SCORED THEMSELVES SIGNIFICANTLY AND CONSISTENTLY HIGHER THAN DID TEACHERS ON EFFECTIVENESS IN SUPERVISION, THAT OLDER TEACHERS TENDED TO REGARD PRINCIPALS AS MORE EFFECTIVE SUPERVISORS THAN YOUNGER TEACHERS, THAT TEACHERS IN LARGER SCHOOLS AND WITH MORE TRAINING REGARDED PRINCIPALS AS MORE EFFECTIVE SUPERVISORS, AND THAT PRINCIPALS WERE RATED HIGHER BY MALE THAN BY FEMALE TEACHERS AS PROVIDING SUPERVISORY STIMULI. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION, (CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, FEBRUARY 7-10, 1968). (JK)

ED020579

PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

By

Lawrence J. Marquit, Ed.D.
Educational Research Council of America

Presented at the
1968 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
February 7-10, 1968
Chicago, Illinois

EA 001 423

PROBLEM

Recent developments in educational administration have indicated that the high school principal plays an ever increasing role in the improvement of the instructional program. That such a role is necessary for the principal has been supported by Franseth,[1] Downey,[2] and Goldman,[3] to mention a few. How the principal goes about influencing or causing this improvement will obviously vary from principal to principal. These variations can be attributable to a variety of factors, as personality, personal philosophy and convictions, school district policy, or geographic location (e.g., urban vs. suburban).

If instructional improvement requires teachers to change their behavior, and if the principal is charged with the responsibility for bringing about such improvement then it follows that the secondary school principal must do something to change teachers' behavior. If the teacher is not aware of what the principal is doing, then as far as the teacher is concerned there is no effective supervisory program. If the awareness of principals' supervisory programs can be measured, how aware are teachers and principals of the supervisory program? If this awareness were to be measured, then the principal can at least have an index of the impact of his

---

[1]Jane Franseth, Supervision as Leadership (New York: Row, Peterson and Co., 1961).

[2]Lawrence W. Downey in Donald J. Leu and Herbert C. Rudman, eds., Preparation Programs for School Administrators (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University , Seventh U.C.E.A. Career Development Seminar, 1963).

[3]Samuel Goldman, The School Principal (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966).

supervisory program upon his teachers. Those behaviors which the principal exhibits to bring about the overall improvement of instruction are collectively defined as the supervisory program.

Those specific behaviors exhibited by secondary school principals which are intended to bring about specific improvements in instruction are referred to as supervisory behaviors. From a psychological standpoint, the principal demonstrates these behaviors to teachers (verbally or visually or both) in order to elicit a change (hopefully in a positive direction) in teacher behavior. In this way the principal provides auditory and/or visual stimuli to the teacher.

Theoretical Framework

Authorities have indicated that effective supervisory programs are founded in cooperative efforts between teacher and administrator.[4] That is, the principal and teacher must be "open," and mutually understand what the other is doing. Since "the effective principal does not tell, persuade, coerce, or manipulate others to accept his will,"[5] the teacher should be aware of what the principal is doing as he articulates or implements the supervisory program.

---

[4]John K. Hemphill, "Administration as Problem Solving," in Andrew W. Halpin, ed., Administrative Theory in Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958); Cf: Herbert A. Thelen, Dynamics of Groups at Work (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), and John A. Bartky, Supervision as Human Relations (Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1953), Chapters XIII-XIV.

[5]Franseth, op. cit.

These supervisory stimuli must be received by the teacher if the principal is to be credited with affecting change. In other words, teachers must first perceive the stimulus if they are to respond to it. If there are no perceptions, then for all intents and purposes there have been no conscious stimuli; and if there have been no conscious stimuli then there was no supervision.

HYPOTHESES

The major objective of the present study was to examine how teachers and principals perceived supervisory stimuli. It was hypothesized that:

H_1: Teachers' perceptions of the frequency of supervisory stimuli will be significantly different from principals' perceptions of the same stimuli.

H_2: There is a significant relationship between each of the following factors: the sex, age, experience, and positions previously held by principals, and the perceptions of teachers regarding the frequency of the principals' supervisory stimuli.

H_3: The principals' sex, age, experience, and size of the school in which they work will each be significantly related to their self perceptions of the frequency of supervisory stimuli.

H_4: The sex, age, experience, educational backgrounds, and the size of the schools in which teachers work will each be significantly related to their perceptions of the frequency of their principals' supervisory stimuli.

H_5: **Tenure-teacher perceptions of the frequency of supervisory stimuli will be significantly different from non-tenure teachers' perceptions of supervisory stimuli.**

METHOD

An instrument was designed based on the various supervisory tasks outlined by Harris.[6] Following a pilot study of the instrument, it was refined into a thirty-six item questionnaire entitled the Opinion Inventory of Supervision (OIS). Part I of the OIS contained four items in each of the following nine categories of supervisory tasks: Curriculum development, Instructional Organization, Staffing, Providing Instructional Aids, Orientation of New Instructional Staff, Providing In-Service Education and Professional Growth, Coordinating Special Services, Developing School-Community Relations, and Evaluating. A copy of the instrument is shown in Appendix I. Two forms were constructed, Form T for Teachers, and Form P (identical to Form T except for minor grammatical changes) for principals. Part II was concerned with demographic variables.

The OIS was administered in 15 three- and four-year secondary schools in New York State. They were selected according to a stratified random sampling procedure according to student population, geographic location, and status as a city or village school district. Table 1, on the following page, summarizes the sample.

The items on the OIS required the respondent to check off a numerical point on an ascending 5 point scale. The lowest point, 1, meant "never or almost never" does the respondent see the described behavior exhibited by the principal.

---

[6]Ben M. Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963), Chapters I-VII.

TABLE 1

Summary of Data Describing The Sample for The Opinion Inventory of Supervision

School I.D.	Student Enrollment	Class	Respondents (N's)	
			Teachers	Principals
1	103	village	9	1
2	272	village	17	1
3	292	village	19	1
4	311	village	34	1
5	435	city	25	1
6	457	city	30	1
7	523	city	25	1
8	1,097	city	54	1
9	1,208	city	61	1
10	1,254	city	63	1
11	1,374	city	69	1
12	1,725	city	61	1
13	2,126	village	86	1
14	2,575	city	78	1
15	3,500	city	65	1
TOTALS	—	—	696	15

The highest point, 5, meant that the respondent "always or almost always" saw the principal exhibiting the described behavior. The highest possible total score which a given respondent can attain was 180. Such a score was interpreted to mean that the respondent perceived that the principal was exhibiting the described behaviors very frequently. The lowest total score possible was 36, and was interpreted to mean that the respondent was not aware of any of the described behaviors being exhibited by the principal. This total score is referred to as the Composite Stimulus Perception Score, or CSPS. If the CSPS is divided by nine (the total number of categories), the result is the mean CSPS, or CSPS. The instrument also provided for sub-scores in each of the nine supervisory categories. In each category the lowest possible score was 4, and the highest, 20.

In testing the hypotheses, differences between means were considered significant only if they were less than or equal to the .05 level; correlation coefficients were considered significant only if the probability that the population correlation coefficient was equal to zero was less than or equal to .05.

Summary of the Findings and Conclusions

Point-biserial correlation coefficients and t-tests indicated that there was significant correlation and significant differences between teachers' scores and principals scores on the OIS, with the principals scoring consistently higher. For the most part, the extent of significance was such that the probability that these relationships and differences between means were the result of chance alone was less than .01. A summary of these data is shown in Table 2 on the following page.

The data did not reveal any significant relationships between principals' sex and their respective teachers' perceptions of the frequency of supervisory stimuli.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed to determine the extent of the relationship between principals' ages and their respective teachers' scores on the OIS. Such trend analysis suggested that as principals grew older, their teachers tended to score significantly lower on the OIS. The probability that this trend was attributable to chance alone was less than .01. A summary of these data is shown in Table 3, on page 9 .

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed to determine the extent of the relationships between principals' experience and their respective teachers' scores on the OIS. Such trend analysis showed that as principals gained in experience, their teachers tended to score significantly lower on the OIS. The probability that this trend was attributable to chance alone was less than .01. A Summary of these data is shown in Table 4, on page 10 .

Table 2

Comparison of Mean Scores on the Opinion Inventory of Supervision Between Teachers and Principals

Stimulus Variable	Teachers' Mean (N=696)	Principals' Mean (N=15)	$\underline{t}$ [a]	Corr. [b] r_{xy}
Curriculum Development	8.26	12.47	4.4172**	+.516**
Instruc. Organization	7.73	12.93	5.6326**	+.652**
Staffing	11.49	16.80	5.0680**	+.589**
Prov. Inst. Aids	9.14	13.07	4.2139**	+.493**
Orientation of New Staff	10.13	12.93	2.8954**	+.341**
Providing In-Svc. Educ.	8.17	11.13	3.7092**	+.435**
Coord. Spec. Services	9.18	14.27	5.0399**	+.586**
Schl.-Comm. Relations	12.23	14.80	2.5305*	+.299**
Evaluating	10.89	15.47	3.8738**	+.454**
CSPS	87.13	123.80	5.5860**	+.647**
$\overline{\text{CSPS}}$	9.68	13.68	5.5860**	+.647**

[a] **indicates a significant difference at the .01 level.
*indicates a significant difference at the .05 level.

[b] point-biserial correlation coefficients.
x = teachers' scores, y = principals' scores.

Table 3

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Principals' Ages and Teachers' Means on the OIS

Stimulus Variable	r_{xy}[a]	Significance
Curriculum Development	-.115	**
Instructional Organization	-.125	**
Staffing	-.034	••
Providing Ins. Aids	-.008	••
Orientation of New Staff	+.078	*
Providing In-Service Education	-.128	**
Coord. Special Services	-.183	**
School-Community Relations	+.112	**
Evaluating	-.075	••
CSPS	-.070	••

[a] x = principals' age
y = teachers' scores
** indicates significance at the .01 level.
* indicates significance at the .05 level.

Table 4

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for Principals' Experience and Teachers' Means on the OIS

Stimulus Variable	r_{xy} [a]	Significance [b]
Curriculum Development	-.288	**
Instructional Organization	-.213	**
Staffing	-.176	**
Providing Inst. Aids	-.034	..
Orientation of New Staff	-.132	**
Providing In-Service Educ.	-.264	**
Coord. Special Services.	-.250	**
School-Community Relations	-.139	**
Evaluating	-.293	**
CSPS	-.268	**

[a] x = principals' experience
y = teachers' scores

[b] **Indicates significance at the .01 level.
*Indicates significance at the .05 level.

The data did not reveal any significant relationships existing between principals' prior positions and their respective teachers' scores on the OIS.

The data did not reveal any significant relationships between principals' sex and their own perceptions of the frequency of supervisory stimuli.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients and F-tests were computed and indicated that there was neither significant correlations nor significant differences between principals' age-grouping scores or between principals' experience-group scores on the OIS.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients and t-tests were computed and indicated that there was neither significant correlations nor significant differences between principals' school-size group scores on the OIS.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients and F-tests were computed, and the results indicated that there were significant correlations and significant differences between teachers' age-group scores on the OIS. The data suggested that as teachers' ages increase, they tended to score significantly higher on the OIS. For the most part, the extent of significance was such that the probability that these relationships and differences between means were the result of chance alone was less than .01. A summary of these data is shown in Table 5, on page 14. The results also indicated that there were significant correlations and significant differences between teachers' school-size group scores on the OIS. The data strongly suggested that as the pupil enrollment of a school increased, the teachers' scores on the OIS tended to increase. The extent of significance was such that the probability that these relationships and differences between means

were the result of chance alone was less than .05. A summary of these data is shown in Table 6, on page 15 .

Educational backgrounds were significantly associated with at least two categories of teachers' OIS scores. There was a slight tendency for those teachers with more preparation to score higher. A summary of the data is presented in Table 7, on page 16 .

The data indicated that teachers' experience is significantly associated with their OIS scores, and that as their experience increased they tended to score higher on that instrument. A summary of the data is shown in Table 8, on page 17 .

Point-biserial correlation coefficients and t-tests were computed and indicated that there were significant tenure-group scores on the OIS. The data strongly suggested a trend for tenure-teachers to score significantly higher than non-tenure teachers on the OIS. The extent of significance was such that the probability that these relationships and differences between means were the result of chance was less than .01. A summary of these data is shown in Table 9, on page 18 .

DISCUSSION

It was found that teachers perceived their principals as "rarely" or "sometimes" providing supervisory stimuli. Principals, on the other hand, perceived themselves as providing such stimuli as "sometimes" or "often." These findings suggest that principals perceived themselves as providing supervisory stimuli significantly more frequently than did their teachers. This may be an understandable outcome since perceptions of self behaviors are regarded in terms of contexts which are subject to uniquely individual interpretations. Hence, principals' perceptions of their own be-

havior may be expected to be different from their teachers'.

Sex as a Factor in Perception

Although the male teachers scored consistently higher than the females, significant differences were found only in the Curriculum Development variable and the Composite Stimulus Perception Score. The males in the sample may have scored significantly higher than did the females for a few reasons. For example, the differences were inherent in the sex differences of the respondents. If the differences were not inherent, they may have been because males were exposed to the situation (included as items regarding the Curriculum Development variable of the OIS) more frequently than were the females. It would appear that the significant difference in the Curriculum Development variable was sufficiently high to be reflected in the Composite Stimulus Perception Scores.

The fact that the male teachers scored consistently higher in every variable (but not necessarily significantly higher), suggests that perhaps males were more aware of the amount of supervisory stimuli provided by their principals. Principals may have related with their teachers in such a way as to favor the males, or at least behave in such a way as to make the males more aware.

A Chi-square test based on an expected frequency of fifty-percent males and fifty-percent females indicated that the sampling distribution of the sexes in the present study was not significantly different from that ration.

Age as a Factor in Perception

Significant positive correlations were found between principals' ages and their respective teachers' scores in the Orientation of New Instructional Staff and School-Community Relations variables.

Table 5

Age Group Means for All Teachers on the Opinion Inventory of Supervision

Stimulus Variable	Age Group Means					F[a]	Correlation[b]
	-30 (N=214)	30-39 (N=198)	40-49 (N=145)	50-59 (N=107)	60+ (N=32)		
Curriculum Development	7.97	8.24	8.08	9.11	8.34	1.8863	+.074
Instruc. Organization	7.48	7.63	7.63	8.85	6.78	3.6406**	+.064
Staffing	11.27	11.56	11.05	12.16	12.37	1.7301	+.063
Provid. Instruc. Aids	8.28	8.77	9.48	10.75	10.28	10.7540**	+.231**
Orienting New Staff	9.78	9.74	9.76	11.82	10.91	7.5432**	+.149**
Prov. In-Svc. Educ.	7.90	7.92	8.28	8.90	8.56	2.4226*	+.105**
Coord. Sp. Services	8.78	8.96	9.11	10.57	8.78	4.3275**	+.104**
Sch.-Comm. Relations	12.07	12.16	11.79	13.16	12.59	2.1467	+.063
Evaluating	10.91	10.80	10.66	11.19	11.31	0.2908	+.108
CSPS	84.25	86.12	85.49	96.22	89.62	4.5415**	+.122**

[a]**Indicates significance at the .01 level. *Indicates significance at the .05 level.

[b]Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients. **Indicates significance at the .01 level. *Indicates significance at the .05 level

Table 6

School Size Means for all Teachers on the OIS

Stimulus Variable	Small Schools (N=159)	Large Schools (N=537)	t[a]	Corr.[b]
Curriculum Development	8.18	8.28	0.3033	+.115**
Instruc. Organization	7.30	7.86	1.7413	+.066
Staffing	10.80	11.70	2.4807*	+.094*
Providing Instruc. Aids	10.02	8.88	3.5509**	-.134**
Orienting New Staff	9.01	10.46	4.3565**	+.163**
Providing In-Service Ed.	8.16	8.17	0.0492	+.019
Coord. Spec. Services	8.21	9.46	2.3914**	+.135**
Schl.-Comm. Relations	10.95	12.61	4.7577**	+.178**
Evaluating	11.01	10.85	0.3807	-.145**
CSPS	83.55	88.19	2.0320*	+.077*
$\overline{\text{CSPS}}$	9.28	9.80	2.0320*	+.077*

[a]*indicates significance at the .05 level.
**indicates significance at the .01 level.

[b]Point-biserial correlation coefficients. Levels of significance are the same as for above.

Table 7

Educational Background Group Means for all Teachers on the the Opinion Inventory of Supervision

Stimulus Variable	Educational Background Group Means										F[b]	Corr.[c]
	ND[a] (N=5)	BS (N=130)	+15 (N=94)	+30 (N=124)	+60 (N=19)	M (N=128)	+15 (N=97)	+30 (N=59)	+60 (N=36)	Doc. (N=4)		
Curriculum Development	8.00	8.03	7.89	8.42	8.47	8.08	8.63	8.42	8.75	8.75	0.4171	+.051
Instruc. Organization	6.60	7.65	7.64	7.67	6.84	7.83	8.05	7.98	7.28	9.50	0.5120	+.030
Staffing	13.20	11.25	10.99	11.26	11.84	11.52	12.86	11.42	10.25	13.80	2.0725*	+.046
Providing Inst. Aids	10.40	8.34	8.89	9.22	9.68	9.26	9.45	9.25	10.19	13.25	1.9673*	+.117**
Orienting New Staff	13.20	9.76	9.96	10.31	9.74	10.30	10.27	9.75	10.11	15.50	1.6477	+.031
Providing In-Service Ed.	7.60	7.67	8.05	8.38	8.42	7.87	8.91	7.90	8.39	10.50	1.4474	+.062
Coord. Sp. Services	9.80	8.38	9.29	9.35	8.84	8.02	10.19	9.10	8.97	9.18	1.5685	+.071
Schl.-Comm. Relations	13.80	11.88	11.77	12.14	11.68	12.62	12.92	12,15	11,83	13,25	0.9404	+.055
Evaluating	9.80	10.97	10.66	11.13	10.63	10.18	11.28	11.20	11.50	11.25	0.0638	+.020
CSPS	90.40	83.82	85.15	87.47	86.11	87.00	92.45	87.39	86.75	106.25	1.0594	+.075

[a]No Degree

[b]*indicates significance at the .05 level.
**indicates significance at the .01 level.

[c]Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients. Levels of significance are the same as for the above.

Table 8

Experience Group Means for all Teachers on the Opinion Inventory of Supervision

Stimulus Variable	Experience Group Means				F[a]	Corr.[b]
	-3 yrs. (N=131)	3-6 yrs. (N=171)	6-10 yrs. (N=104)	10+ yrs. (N=290)		
Curriculum Development	7.60	8.27	7.95	8.66	2.8216*	+.096*
Instruc. Organization	7.40	7.47	7.74	8.03	1.3826	+.076
Staffing	11.05	10.91	11.81	11.93	3.1118*	+.105**
Providing Inst. Aids	8.06	8.38	8.69	9.14	10.1356**	+.198**
Orienting New Staff	9.56	9.78	10.02	10.63	3.3151*	+.121**
Providing In-Service Ed.	7.63	8.04	7.98	8.55	3.0727*	+.114**
Coord. Sp. Services	8.24	9.27	9.13	9.55	3.5171*	+.111**
Schl.-Comm. Relations	11.32	12.10	12.50	12.62	3.5637*	+.121**
Evaluating	10.52	11.01	10.78	11.02	0.4188	+.034
CSPS	81.26	85.60	86.66	90.85	4.7265**	+.140**

[a]*indicates significance at the .05 level. **indicates significance at the .01 level.

[b]Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients. Levels of significance are the same as for the above.

Table 9

Tenure Group Means for all Teachers on the OIS

Stimulus Variable	Tenure Status Means		t^a	Corr.^{b}
	Yes (N=445)	No (N=251)		
Curriculum Development	8.36	8.10	0.9157	+.035
Instruc. Organization	7.91	7.42	1.7367	+.066
Staffing	11.80	10.97	2.5973**	+.098*
Providing Instruc. Aids	9.72	8.17	5.8314**	+.216**
Orienting New Staff	10.46	9.56	3.0444**	+.115**
Providing In-Service Ed.	8.39	7.79	2.4793*	+.094*
Coord. Spec. Services	9.48	8.64	2.7651**	+.104**
Schl.-Comm. Relations	12.64	11.50	3.7098**	+.140**
Evaluating	10.83	11.00	0.4779	-.018
CSPS	89.52	82.99	3.2853**	+.124**
$\overline{\text{CSPS}}$	9.95	9.22	3.2853**	+.124**

[a]*indicates significant difference at the .05 level. **indicates significant difference at the .01 level.

[b]Point-biserial correlation coefficients. Levels of significance are the same as for above.

This finding suggests that as principals increased in age their respective teachers tended to score higher on those variables. There is the implication that as principals grow older, they create some climate or "aura" whereby their teachers' scores tend to become higher on those variables.

Significant negative correlations were found in the Curriculum Development, Instructional Organization, Providing In-Service Education and Professional Growth, and Coordinating Special Services variables. In these instances, there was a tendency for teachers to score lower on the OIS as their principals increased in age.

No significant differences or correlations were found between principals' age groups, but many were found between teachers' age groups. Significant differences between age groups of teachers were found in the Instructional Organization, Providing In-Service Education and Professional Growth, and Coordinating Special Services variables, as well as the Composite Stimulus Perception Scores. Significant positive correlations were also found in all of the latter with the exception of the Instructional Organization variable. For the most part, the highest means were attained by the 50-59 years age group of teachers. The lowest scores were obtained by the -30 years age group in four of the nine variables.

These findings suggest that age is significantly associated with teachers' perceptions of the frequency of supervisory stimuli; and that as teachers become older, they tend to score higher on the OIS. One possible reason for this outcome may be that maturity is accompanied by an increased sensitivity towards human behaviors, and could contribute towards teachers' awareness of supervisory behaviors.

A Chi-square test revealed that the obtained age-group distribution of the teachers in the sample was not significantly different from the age distribution of secondary school teachers in the United States.[7] It is possible that the findings herein approximate the findings that might be found in the population of public secondary school teachers in the United States at-large.

Experience as a Factor in Perception

With the exception of the Providing Instructional Aids variable, all of the stimulus variables and the CSPS were significantly negatively correlated between principals' experience and their respective teachers' scores. Such a finding suggests that as principals gain in experience, their teachers tend to score lower on the OIS. It is curious that while increases in principals' ages tended to be associated with higher teachers' scores on the Curriculum Development and School-Community Relations variables, increases in principals' experience tended to be associated with lower teachers' scores in these same variables.

No significant differences or correlations were found between principals' experience groups. However, significant differences and significant correlations were found among teachers' experience groups on the CSPS and all of the variables except those of Instructional Organization and Evaluating. In nearly every case, the highest means were attained by the 10+ years group. Such findings suggest that while experience may not be significantly associated with perceptions of the

---

[7] Hazel Davis and Eleanor Donald, The American Public School Teacher, 1960-1961 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Research Division, Research Monograph 1963-M2, 1963).

frequency of supervisory stimuli among principals' experience groups, it did appear to be a significant factor among the teachers; and that as teachers gained in experience, they tended to score higher on the OIS.

The larger number of significant differences and significant correlations between experience groups as compared to age groups suggested that experience appeared to be a more relevant factor than age in terms of its association with OIS scores.

Educational Background as a Factor in Perception

Although the principals in the sample represented a great diversity of prior professional statuses, no significant differences between principals' scores were found. Between teachers' educational background groups, significant differences were found in the Staffing and Providing Instructional Aids variables, with the Doctoral group attaining the highest means in each instance. The inference that teachers with a Doctoral degree are most perceptive in terms of these variables may not always be true, since the next highest score was achieved by those with no degree whatever! The Bachelor's degree group scored lowest in the latter variable, while the Master's degree +60 group scored lowest in the former.

A significant positive correlation was found in the Providing Instructional Aids variable, indicating that as teachers' professional preparation increased they tended to score higher on that variable. A possible explanation may be that the higher amount of educational background would be concurrent with a greater familiarity with research, literature, trends, and available materials in several fields or disciplines. Such a familiarity may have contributed towards a proportionate increased accumulation of instructional aids. Principals, perhaps knowing this,

may have encouraged such teachers to share their materials with their fellow teachers.

The Doctoral group scored highest in six of the variables as well as the CSPS. The lowest scores were distributed among several of the groups. There did not appear to be any general pattern of significant differences or correlations which would lend support to the conclusion that educational background is a major factor associated with teachers' awareness of supervisory stimuli.

School Size as a Factor in Perception

No significant differences and no significant correlations were found in comparing means between large-school and small-school principals. However, the data did reveal that school size appeared to be significantly associated with teachers' scores on the OIS.

In comparing large-school teachers' means with small-school teachers' means, significant differences and significant positive correlations were found in the Staffing, Orientation of New Instructional Staff, Coordinating Special Services, and School-Community Relations variables as well as on the CSPS. Such a group of findings suggests two things. First, that large-school teachers score significantly higher than do small-school teachers on these latter variables, as well as on the CSPS. Second, that as secondary school enrollments increased, the teachers in those schools tended to score significantly higher in those areas. The significant difference and significant negative correlation on the Providing Instructional Aids variable implies that small-school teachers not only scored higher on that variable, but that as secondary school enrollments increased, the teachers in those schools tended to score lower on that variable. A significant positive correlation was found

for the Curriculum Development variable, but no significant difference. This would suggest that teachers in those schools tended to score higher, but not necessarily significantly so. The significant negative correlation on the Evaluating variable suggested that as secondary school pupil enrollments increased, the teachers in those schools tended to score lower. While the correlations were not sufficiently high to warrant predictability, they were high enough to reject the null hypothesis that the population correlation coefficient was equal to zero.

Tenure Status as a Factor in Perception

The data revealed that teacher tenure status appears to be significantly associated with teachers' scores on the OIS. The tenure-teacher group scored consistently higher than the non-tenure group in every variable as well as on the CSPS. These differences were significant in all but three variables: Curriculum Development, Instructional Organization, and Evaluating. Each of these significant differences was accompanied by an equally significant positive correlation. These findings suggest that as teachers achieved tenure status they tended to score significantly higher than did the probationary teachers.

The tenure-teacher group was likely to be the older and more experienced group. Hence, their higher means may be attributable to factors similar to those suggested earlier with regard to age.

Suggestions For Further Research

A pilot study was used to refine the Opinion Inventory of Supervision, an original instrument constructed by the present investigator. In its present state the instrument appears able to provide sufficient discrimination enabling appro-

priate statistical analyses for comparing groups of secondary school teachers and principals. However, there does appear to be some question about the ability of the OIS to sensitively discriminate between principals. Bartlett's test results generally showed homogeneity of variance among the principals. It is difficult to say whether this homogeneity (or lack of heterogeneity) is due to inadequacies of the instrument or because of a true homogeneous sample of principals. It is recommended that large groups of principals be administered Form P of the OIS and further research in this area be carried out.

A reliability test of internal consistency revealed an r of .88. This is sufficiently high to evaluate grouped data, but its value for use with individuals is dubious.

A panel of nine educators rated the content validity of the OIS as "high." It is recommended that further research be undertaken to determine more empirical measures of validity.

It is suggested that research be undertaken to determine the psychological and/or environmental conditions which may have contributed towards the significant results. For example, did principals score significantly higher than teachers because they know what they are doing better than do the teachers? This may be, but how often are others more aware of our idiosyncrasies than we are? Some may hold that teachers may know their principals better than the principals know themselves. What factors contribute to this difference? It is also possible that these significant differences occurred because the principals; supervisory behaviors were more manipulative than cooperative. Further research may be undertaken to determine the extent of principals' manipulative as compared to cooperative

programs of supervision.

It has been seen that teachers' ages and experience appeared to be correlated with their scores on the OIS; and that experience seemed to be the more significant factor. As teachers gain in experience (or age), do they score higher because they are simply more aware of the amount of their principals' supervisory behavior, or is it because they have a greater understanding of their behavior? It is believed that the latter is more relevant and that further research be undertaken to substantiate this.

Further research is needed to determine the contributory factors which may account for the significant differences between large- and small-school teacher groups. What factors--such as teacher turnover, or staff size--are responsible for significant differences on the Staffing variable? Why did the large-school teachers score significantly higher than the small-school teachers on the Orientation of New Instructional Staff variable? Was it because of greater staff involvements? More principal exposure? Both? Research is needed to determine the effect of pupil population on teacher awareness of supervisory behavior.

Tenure teachers scored significantly higher than their non-tenure confreres in every case. Further research may seek to determine if the higher status of the tenure teacher permits a greater ease of teacher-principal interaction, thus making the tenure teacher more aware of supervisory behavior.

APPENDIX I

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FORM P

Introduction

We all know that the duties and responsibilities of school principals can vary greatly from one school district to another. We also know that no two principals behave exactly alike even in the same school district. We do not know, however, precisely how much difference there is in this behavior. It is the purpose of this study to find out just how much variance there is among principals as they perform their supervisory duties.

In the accompanying questionnaire you will find several statements which ask you to express your opinion as to how much supervision you provide your teaching staff. Since we are interested only in opinions there naturally can be no right or wrong answers. So please react to each statement in terms of how you feel about it.

You may rest assured that no one but this researcher will see your answer sheet. We are interested in grouped data only and therefore do not wish you to place your name on the answer sheet.

Should you desire a summary of the information from this study, please indicate this by completing the statement below.

Thank you for your cooperation. Your assistance is most appreciated.

Please send me a summary of the results of this study [ ]

Name of School_____

DIRECTIONS

Please put your answers on the answer sheets only.

Please read each item carefully.

Do not put your name on this Inventory.

Identification marks of any kind will not be found on this Inventory.

You may use pen or pencil.

Please answer all items--incomplete Inventories cannot be used.

After reading each statement, determine whether you feel:

The statement describes an event or instance which, as far as you know, is:

1-never, or almost never, the case

2-rarely or seldom the case

3-sometimes the case

4-often the case

5-always, or almost always, the case

When you have decided on your response, place a check or an X in the appropriate space on your first answer sheet.

Please Turn the Page

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes 4-often
5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "I..."

1. ...emphasize the role of the teachers when discussing the instructional program with members of the community.

2. ...succeed in evaluating teachers accurately.

3. ...have a lot of influence in hiring new teachers.

4. ...encourage my teachers to include the special services of the district in their lessons or instructional program.

5. ...play a major role in orienting new teachers with the community.

6. ...arrange for teachers' requisitions for instructional materials they use, such as film strips, records, charts, etc.

7. ...give demonstration lessons.

8. ...observe classroom teaching.

9. ...provide opportunities for in-service conferences and workshops.

10. ...work with teachers to improve the scope and sequence of their curricula.

11. ...show new teachers how to operate the audio-visual equipment and/or familiarize them with the library and other instructional facilities of the school.

12. ...give teachers special time to plan and develop curriculum revisions.

13. ...encourage teachers to join community organizations (Scouts, Grange, Service clubs, etc.).

14. ...coordinate the special services of my building as by arranging guidance or audio-visual schedules to make them available for teachers.

15. ...consult my teachers before organizing the students into different classes or sections for the coming year or semester.

16. ...help teachers evaluate the instructional aids used in their classes.

17. ..."spell out" the duties and responsibilities to new teachers, even though this information is available from the faculty handbook or other sources.

Please Turn the Page

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes 4-often
5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "I..."

18. ...take advante of teachers' special abilities, especially when deciding committee assignments.

19. ...encourage teachers to select necessary audio-visual, and other instructional materials with my advice.

20. ...advise teachers to read a particular book, or take a certain course if it is felt that she lacks professional knowledge in this area.

21. ...devote a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations.

22. ...provide professional staff members with an opportunity to meet new professional candidates who seek a position in this school.

23. ...play a major role in orienting new teachers with the existing school staff.

24. ...organize teachers' schedules in such a way that team instruction and team or individual planning are facilitated.

25. ...discuss my evaluations of instruction directly with the teachers involved.

26. ...help teachers use the special services of our district as by arranging for field trip transportation or arranging student referrals to the appropriate staff (psychologist, nurse, reading teacher, etc.).

27. ...make it easy for teachers to get out of their classes to visit another class in action.

28. ...help teachers organize their instructional programs as by suggesting how much time to spend in each content area of their curricula.

29. ...make comments or remarks to teachers about their lesson plans meeting the goals of their curricula.

30. ...emphasize the contributions which the special services personnel can offer the teachers in their instructional programs.

31. ...send teachers prompt reports of my evaluations of their teaching.

Please Turn the Page

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes 4-often
5-always, or almost always.

Please precede each statement with "I..."

32. ...assist teachers with organizing special class groups, committees, and other areas of instructional organization.

33. ...assist teachers in establishing curriculum goals and academic standards for their classes.

34. ...permit teachers to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, paper, etc.) in their rooms.

35. ...emphasize the advantages of working here when interviewing a professional candidate.

36. ...explain our instructional program to parents and other members of the community.

<u>Please be sure to see your Second Answer Sheet</u>

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FIRST ANSWER SHEET

	Never or almost Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always or almost Always
1.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never or almost Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always or almost always
19.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	1	2	3	4	5

Please Turn the Page

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

SECOND ANSWER SHEET

37. Please indicate your sex: Male_____ Female_____

38. Please indicate your age group:

(1) under 30___ (2) 30-39___ (3) 40-49___ (4) 50-59___ (5) 60+___

39. Years of administrative experience:

(1) under 3___ (2) 3-6___ (3) 7-10___ (4) 10+___

40. Please indicate the type of position you held immediately before you became an administrator (not necessarily your present position) by checking the appropriate space:

0___I was not in teaching

I was in teaching. I taught in the following area:

1___English (including reading, speech or drama)

2___Foreign Language

3___Science

4___Math

5___Social Studies

6___Music, fine arts or industrial arts

7___Physical Education

8___Kindergarten or common branch (grades 1-6)

9___Other (includes home economics, driver education or others)

Thank you very much for your cooperation

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FORM T

Introduction

We all know that the duties and responsibilities of school principals can vary greatly from one school district to another. We also know that no two principals behave exactly alike even in the same school district. We do not know, however, precisely how much difference there is in this behavior. It is the purpose of this study to find out just how much variance there is among principals as they perform their supervisory duties.

In the accompanying questionnaire you will find several statements which ask you to express your opinion as to how much supervision your principal provides. Since we are interested only in opinions there naturally can be no right or wrong answers. So please react to each statement in terms of how you feel about it.

You may rest assured that no one but this researcher will see your answer sheet. We are interested in grouped data only and therefore do not wish you to place your name on the answer sheet.

Thank you for your cooperation. Your assistance is most appreciated.

DIRECTIONS

Please put your answers on the answer sheets only.

Please read each item carefully.

Do not put your name on this Inventory.

Identification marks of any kind will not be found on this Inventory.

You may use pen or pencil.

Please answer all items--incomplete Inventories cannot be used.

After reading each statement, determine whether you feel:

The statement describes an event or instance which, as far as you know, is:

1-never, or almost never, the case

2-rarely or seldom the case

3-sometimes the case

4-often the case

5-always, or almost always, the case

When you have decided on your response, place a check or an X in the appropriate space <u>on your first answer sheet</u>.

Please Turn the Page

ey: 1-Never, or almost never; 2-Rarely; 3-Sometimes 4-Often; 5-Always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal..."

1. ...emphasizes the role of teachers when discussing the instructional program with members of the community.

2. ....succeeds in evaluating my teaching accurately.

3. ...has a lot of influence in hiring new teachers.

4. ...encourages me to include the special services personnel of the district in my lessons or instructional program.

5. ...plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the community.

6. ...arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts, etc.

7. ...gives demonstration lessons.

8. ...observes my teaching in the classroom.

9. ...provides me with opportunities for in-service conferences and workshops.

10. ...works with me to improve the scope and sequence of my curriculum.

11. ...shows new teachers how to operate the audio-visual equipment and/or familiarizes them with the library and other instructional facilities of the school.

12. ...gives me special time to plan and develop curriculum revisions.

13. ...encourages me to join community organizations (Scouts, Grange, Service clubs, etc.

14. ...coordinates the special services of my building as by arranging guidance or audio-visual schedules to make them available for me.

15. ...consults me before organizing the students into different classes or sections for the coming year or semester.

16. ...helps me to evaluate the instructional aids which I use in my classroom.

17. ..."spells out" the duties and responsibilities to new teachers, even though this information is available from the faculty handbook or other sources.

18. ...capitalizes on my special abilities, especially when deciding committee assignments.

19. ...encourages me to select necessary audio-visual, and other instructional materials with his advice.

20. ...advises me to read a particular book or take a certain course if he feels that I have a lack in an area of professional knowledge.

21. ...devotes a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations.

please turn the page

Key: 1-Never, or almost never; 2-Rarely; 3-Sometimes; 4-Often; 5-Always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal..."

22. ...provides me with an opportunity to meet new professional candidates who seek a position in this school.

23. ...plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the existing school staff.

24. ...organizes my schedule in such a way that things like team instruction and team planning or individual planning are facilitated.

25. ...discusses his evaluations of my instruction with me.

26. ...helps me to use the special services of our district as by arranging for field trip transportation or arranging student referrals to the appropriate staff (psychologist, nurse, reading teachers, etc.)

27. ...makes it easy for me to get out of my class to visit another class in action.

28. ...helps me organize my instructional program as by suggesting how much time to spend in each content area of the curriculum.

29. ...comments or remarks to me about my lesson plans meeting the goals of the curriculum.

30. ...emphasizes the contributions which the special services personnel can make in my instructional program.

31. ...sends me a prompt report of his evaluations of my teaching.

32. ...helps me in establishing curriculum goals and academic standards for my class.

33. ...helps me organize special class groups, committees, and other areas of instructional organization.

34. ...permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, paper, etc.) in my room.

35. ...emphasized the advantages of working here when I was interviewed, or before I was hired. (If present principal was not here when you were hired, to what extent do you feel that the present present principal would do this?)

36. ...explains our instructional program to parents and other members of the community.

Please be Sure to See Your Second Answer Sheet

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FORM T

SECOND ANSWER SHEET

37. Please indicate your sex: Male_____ Female_____

38. Please indicate your age group:

(1) under 30___ (2) 30-39___ (3) 40-49___ (4) 50-59___ (5) 60+___

39. Please indicate your years of teaching experience [include this year as one]:

(1) under 3___ (2) 3-6___ (3) 7-10___ (4) 10+___

40. Please indicate your tenure status in this school:

(1) not on tenure [probationary]___ (2) on tenure___

41. Please indicate your educational background to date:

0___No degree 1___Bachelor's 2___Bachelor's +15 3___+30

4___+60 5___Master's 6___Master's +15 7___+30 8___+60

9___Doctorate

Thank you very much for your cooperation

EA
from ERIC